

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 3

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© February 15, 1995

DOE Lab Review Panel Fails to Pull the Trigger

Into the budget maelstrom raging in Washington, the Galvin report arrived February 1, fulfilling a year-long assignment to recommend "alternative futures" for the costliest scientific relic of the Cold War, the Department of Energy's nationwide empire of laboratories.

The report denounces the DOE lab system as wasteful and drifting, citing believable tales of managerial coagulation, audit requirements run amok, and so forth.

But when it came to the executioner's job, which it was widely expected to perform, the Galvin report went soft, stating that it "does not make any recommendation about the possible closure of specific laboratories..."

For the seasoned, life-clinging turfmeisters of DOE, those words spell salvation, especially at the three weapons labs in DOE's \$6-billion-a-year research system, Los Alamos, Sandia, and Livermore.

The report, by a DOE-appointed committee named after Chairman Robert Galvin, former CEO of Motorola, Inc., dissects the legendary chaos of research a la DOE, and

Gallo Report Finally Emerges—P. 4 Gloom Greets '96 R&D Budget—P. 6

prescribes some remedies. Principal among these is a "corporatization" of labs in the DOE network, though it leaves open the possibility of excluding the weapons labs from this proposal. It also calls for competition for work, and concentration on basic research and engineering, national security, energy, and environment. In those areas, the report recommends, the labs should perform important research that can't or isn't being done elsewhere.

There's no existing example of the proposed corporate style for labs, the report states, adding that it will have to be invented by DOE and Congress. Galvin explained afterwards that the labs, while performing major tasks for the federal government, would be private organizations with their own boards of directors. "They would operate exactly like a private corporation," said Chairman Galvin, who since stepping down as CEO at Motorola in 1990 has headed the company's Executive Committee.

Asked by a reporter whether the proposed corporate structure resembled that of the US Postal Service, Galvin stiffly replied, "I know nothing about the Postal Service. But if there is any resemblance, it is a sheer coincidence."

The likelihood of the proposed corporatization coming about was concisely appraised by a former Congressman on

(Continued on Page 2)

On the Trail of 'Nonsense,' 'Political Pressure' in Science

For a whiff of the ideological winds howling through the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, let's look in on a get-acquainted press session called last week by a Gingrich lieutenant who occupies an influential position in research affairs: Rep. Dana Rohrabacher. A seven-year veteran of speech writing in the Reagan White House, he possesses an unalloyed right-wing pedigree from Orange County, California, the conservative heartland of the Republican Party.

Rohrabacher, a fourth term, is now chairman of the House Science Committee's Energy and Environment Subcommittee, which has law-writing authority over some \$7 billion in R&D programs at the Department of Energy, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

Asked at a budget briefing last week how NASA can be expected to do more with less money, White House Science Advisor John Gibbons told about the truck driver who was asked why he periodically stopped and pounded on the side of his vehicle. "I have a one-ton truck here," the driver explained, "and I've got two tons of canaries on board. So I have to keep half of them flying."

Suffering under flat budgets for several years, the biomedical research community is hoping that well-placed friends on its Congressional Appropriations Committees will spare NIH from further drought. In the Senate, there's Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, a longtime NIH booster who now chairs the full Appropriations Committee. Senator Arlen Specter, of Pennsylvania, home of many medical schools, chairs the NIH subcommittee. In the House, the subcommittee chairman is John Porter, of Illinois, an outspoken friend of NIH. Porter has invited a batch of Nobel laureates to testify February 28 about NIH and biomedical research.

Prodded by the last Congress, the National Science Foundation is venturing into the politically sensitive field of violence research, with an invitation for proposals to establish a "center without walls" or a "national consortium" focused on the subject. With total funding of \$12 million over five years, according to an NSF announcement, the aim is to "advance fundamental knowledge on violence and to train future generations of violence researchers." Deadline for proposals: May 1. For information: Patricia White, Coordinator for the Consortium for Violence Research, National Science Foundation, Room 995, Arlington, Va. 22230, tel. 703/306-1762; fax 703/306-0485; e-mail: pwhite@nsf.gov

... Report Sees Roles for Livermore and Los Alamos

(Continued from Page 1)

the DOE Secretary's Energy Advisory Board, to which the Galvin report was addressed. After Galvin finished his presentation, ex-Rep. Butler Derrick (D-South Carolina) softly advised him: "There's no chance Congress is going to turn you loose with \$6 billion to do your own thing."

The report damns the labs as bloated, wasteful, obsessed with job security, and in misguided pursuit of industrial tasks that should be none of their business. Economic competitiveness is not a proper concern of the labs, the report says, thus undermining DOE's vigorous efforts to jump aboard that politically trendy bandwagon. Galvin and company also charged DOE with squandering \$23 billion on nuclear-cleanup efforts that they say have produced paltry results—in large part, according to the report, because of inadequate scientific and technical backup.

Alternative Futures for the Department of Energy National Laboratories (67 pp., plus appendices) and an accompanying **White Papers Prepared by the Department of Energy** (73 pp., plus appendices—both at no charge). Order from: Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, Department of Energy, AB-1, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-7092; fax 202/586-6279.

A related publication, from the General Accounting Office: **Department of Energy: National Laboratories Need Clearer Missions and Better Management** (GAO/RCED-95-10; 45 pp., no charge). Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

By and large, the 65-page document, plus a similar amount of supplementary material, reads like a machine translation of a dense theological tract. Amid the failures and misdeeds it documents, all contending parties can find solace and justification in its turgid prose, which includes 85 recommendations, from the grand to the minuscule.

In the former category, the Galvin report says DOE's traditional role in nuclear weapons design and testing, now shifting to stockpile maintenance, should not be transferred to the Pentagon, thus reaffirming civilian control, limited though it has been. In the realm of the small and clichéd, the report asserts, "Basic research at the laboratories should be more fully integrated into the national and international research community."

Though it was widely hoped and expected that the report would provide support for terminating one or the other of DOE's two nuclear-weapons design labs, the report did not meet that issue head on. Livermore, it said, should retain its weapons-research capabilities for "several years," and then "transfer, as cost-efficiency allows, over the next five years its activities in nuclear materials development and production" to Los Alamos. Meanwhile, Livermore would shift its attention to countering the spread of nuclear weapons.

One measure of the opacity of the written product may be found in Chairman Galvin's mode of presentation, to an audience of some 250 DOE employees, lobbyists, press, and other onlookers in a downtown Washington hotel ballroom. The Chairman announced that his report does not include the capital city's preferred form of official literature—the executive summary, by tradition a few pages preceding the main body of a report, wherein complexity is reduced to simplicity, prolixity to brevity, and nuances, qualifications, and subtleties are forsaken.

With Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary and some 20 members of the Energy Advisory Board trapped at long tables, Galvin said he would read from the report for the next 45 minutes. As he did, many members of the audience, supplied with copies of the report, attempted to follow him. But as the Chairman chose to alight here and there in the packed text, and intersperse his own comments, the pursuit was difficult.

In a monotone, and with inflections unrelated to substance, on and on he droned before his captive audience. Under the gaze of Secretary O'Leary, the large DOE contingent in the audience sat transfixed, or appeared to be. Some persons with other affiliations slipped away to wait out the reading.

The reading-aloud tactic appears to be a favorite of Chairman Galvin. In November 1992, in his capacity as Co-Chairman of the Commission on the Future of the National Science Foundation, he read the Commission's report to another captive audience, the National Science Board, which consists of university presidents, senior scientists, and industrial executives. Apparently because this was a short report—a mere 11 single-spaced pages—Co-Chairman Galvin left out not a word in his verbal presentation.

The choice of Galvin for the Department of Energy study may have been inspired by the service he rendered NSF. The NSF report was so convoluted in its conclusions about the critical issue of the moment, NSF's proper role in basic research versus assistance to industry, that the textual analysts of science policy could come to no consensus as to its meaning. Sensing the opportunity, NSF management embraced the report and said it would follow its advice.

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$455.00 (two years, \$780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

... 'Proceed Carefully and Wield Sharp Budget Ax'

(Continued from Page 1)

Environmental Protection Agency. He met with about a dozen science writers on February 9, three days after Clinton unveiled his new budget, which Rohrabacher, in chorus with other Republicans, denounced as wasteful, unrestrained, and in conflict with his party's demands for frugality.

Particularly disapproving of Clinton's proposed budget increases for the agencies under his Subcommittee, Rohrabacher softly delivered a drastic message: "My motto is, 'proceed carefully, and wield a sharp budget ax.'" But, at this early point on the legislative calendar, he insisted, "I'm not going to answer questions about specific programs."

Modest in manner, the 47-year-old Congressman comes across as a friendly, likeable guy, though he has proudly compiled a hardnosed record on social-spending issues. On an autobiographical sheet, for example, he says he "inspired the grassroots movement" that led to California's Proposition 187, "which removes illegal aliens from the state's welfare and education rolls."

Rohrabacher pointed out that he previously served on the Space Subcommittee, and said he has a lot to learn about his own Subcommittee's extensive jurisdiction. Formerly an editorial writer on the *Orange County Register*, he said that, as a journalist, he learned to ask questions and listen, and pledged that's what he will do before making any legislative moves.

Like most Congressmen with scientific and technical responsibilities, he is academically trained in neither. He holds a bachelor's degree in history from Long Beach State College and a master's in American studies from the University of Southern California. But, while expressing humility about his knowledge, he made clear that he comes to the chair of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee confident about what needs to be done in federal support of science.

He is committed, he said, "to good science and a balanced

budget," and, elaborating on this principle, he added that "we can cut out the nonsense without having to jeopardize the science at all."

Asked how the "nonsense" will be identified, Rohrabacher said he will seek the opinions of "top-quality" people at forthcoming hearings of his Subcommittee.

Then he added, "But we are also looking into charges that political pressure was put on people to make scientific decisions. And we may have a hearing if we find evidence on that. We may be holding a hearing on that to expose that type of indefensible behavior on the part of certain government officials."

Would he detail the charges of political pressure and say who made them?

"Not yet. Just looking into this," he replied, adding that the Subcommittee would first attend to authorization bills for the agencies in its jurisdiction. Under Republican control, he said, his Subcommittee and the parent Committee would pass bills—a slap at the paltry legislative record of their Democratic predecessors on what was previously called the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. "After that," he said, referring back to his remarks about nonsensical science and political pressure, "we are going to continue working and working hard in some of these other areas I've mentioned."

Reporters persisted, however, with one asking: "When you talk about projects that are 'nonsense' and 'political pressure,' do you have in mind specific episodes, or are you going on a so-called fishing expedition to see whether these things exist?"

Rohrabacher replied: "We've got some specific areas that we not only will be looking at but are looking into to make sure that they would be appropriate for the Subcommittee to hold hearings on. And when the time comes and we think the information is there to hold a hearing, we're going to do that."

(Continued on Page 4)

DOE Labs

(Continued from Page 3)

However, the problems confronting DOE and its Galvin report are not so easily dealt with. Secretary O'Leary's response to the report was both warm, cautious, and disputatious. "I wanted recommendations that challenged the Department and its laboratories to reach new levels of performance in meeting national needs," O'Leary said in a written statement. "To a large extent," she concluded, "the Task Force has met these expectations."

But she went on to criticize the report's dour assessment of DOE's clean-up efforts, claiming that "bold actions to cut costs, reinvent the program, and accelerate clean-up activities" are under way. The Secretary described the "corporatization" proposal as "an unprecedented approach, and thus we will need to learn much more about its potential benefits and liabilities."

In response to the report's advice on the division of

weapons work between Livermore and Los Alamos, O'Leary said, "I have an initial favorable disposition for a careful phase-down of some of Livermore's nuclear weapons work, combined with a re-emphasis on non-proliferation, counter-proliferation, and verification activities."

O'Leary concluded her response by adroitly attributing a message of confidence to the damning report about her Department. "I welcome the Task Force's report and am heartened by their strong validation of the R&D functions of the Department and its National Laboratories."

The report will be discussed at Congressional hearings. But, in the meantime, DOE's research bundle—\$6 billion at its own labs, plus another \$1.3 billion dispensed elsewhere—is a plump target in the Republicans' drive to cut domestic spending, reduce taxes, and raise the defense budget. Severe budget cuts, rather than the Galvin design, are more likely to determine the fate of DOE's aging and obsolete research empire.

... Questions Government Role in Industrial R&D

(Continued from Page 3)

And I fully expect us to hold hearings in those areas. I can't give you the information right now. Why hold a hearing if I'm going to try to make a judgment right now?"

But reporters wanted more on this subject, and Rohrabacher obliged, saying: "I think in the Department of Energy there's lots of examples of things that need to be justified on the basis of their scientific validity rather than on things that may have appeared pretty trendy a few years ago but aren't trendy today."

"All I can say," the Chairman continued, "is a lot of people made a lot of political hay out of scaring the American people to death, and I think a lot of that has been based on phony science, and we're going to have hearings to make sure those claims are either verified or shot down."

A statement distributed by his staff just prior to the meeting echoed the standard Republican position on the appropriate federal role in research, namely, important, high-risk, pre-competitive research absent from the private sector. Asked to elaborate on this subject, Rohrabacher said, "My basic philosophy is that the government should be involved in fundamental research that sets up the private sector to what they want to do to commercialize and utilize their work. But the [government] labs shouldn't be involved in commercial endeavors.... I know that there is this idea about public-private partnership, but the fact is that sometimes public-private partnerships just end up to be a government subsidy for selected businesses. And if we're going to bring down the deficit, we've got to make sure that we're not subsidizing big business as well as we're not subsidizing welfare recipients."

Rohrabacher was asked about the Clinton Administration's Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, a federal collaboration with the automotive Big Three aimed at developing a "clean car." "That's exactly one of the type of things we're going to look at," he said, "to see if that is an appropriate use of government money."

Asked whether the Science Committee has authority to terminate the clean-car venture, Rohrabacher sought the opinion of a staff member, who said indeed it has. With that answer in hand, Rohrabacher said, "It seems to me that we can't ask our poorest citizens to face the marketplace, which is what the Republicans are going to be doing.... How can we tell them that they're going to have to face the marketplace, but we can't ask our own major corporations and special-interest groups to do that?"

Would he confine DOE's labs to nuclear-weapons research? No, he replied, "But we have to make sure that the labs are involved in things that are not being done and can't be done at the same level by the private sector."

How would that principle apply to fusion research?

"That's fundamental research, and that needs to be done by government, of course," Rohrabacher said, adding, "I personally believe that we should try to focus on break-

Internet Access to OSTP

Science policy literature from official quarters is surging onto the Internet and other electronic channels. Following are some addresses for getting at this material:

White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) reports, documents, etc., are on the World Wide Web: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/OSTP.html>

For "a single point of access to all electronic government information on the Internet," OSTP directs attention to "Welcome to the White House: An Interactive Citizens Handbook," at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov>

Via electronic mail, the address for White House press releases, briefings, reports, etc., on science and technology is: To: Publications@Research.AI.MIT.EDU Subject: receive science-technology.

For White House material on environmental subjects: To: Publications@Research.AI.MIT.EDU Subject: receive environment.

For access to science and technology data on 140 federal agency computer systems, the gateway is Fed World, accessible by modem at 703/321-8020 (set modem to n,8,1 and terminal emulation to ANSI), or by Internet (telnet to fedworld.gov). For questions about FedWorld: tel. 703/487-4608. Or, says the OSTP announcement, call Barry Epstein: tel. 202/456-6076; Internet: bepstein@ostp.eop.gov

Through America Online, the National Academy of Sciences has also gone electronic, with an interactive service providing reports, announcements, and other material from the NAS and its affiliates, the National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine. The service can be accessed through America Online's "Education" or "Clubs & Interests" departments or with the keyword "NAS."

through technologies. That if we actually can break through a barrier, it will open up new potential for the private sector and other scientists in universities—not in government. I tend to be very positive toward that type of research."

Would he favor repeal of the Federal Technology Transfer Act, which provides a statutory basis for federal-private collaboration in R&D? "We're going to look at it," Rohrabacher said. "But I'm not telling you we're going to terminate it. We're going to look at it."

A reporter asked whether DOE's substantial role in education, at the graduate and other levels, would be examined for reduction.

"Everything is on the table," Rohrabacher said. "What we've got to do is prioritize. I don't know enough to tell you right now," he continued, pointing out that in the last Congress he focused his attention on space issues. He noted, too, that he's only one of 27 members on a Subcommittee whose legislation must be approved by the full Committee.

Chairman Rohrabacher wound up the session by restating his basic goal: "good science and cutting the budget."—DSG

Dingell Ex-Staffers Release Critical Report on Gallo

The Gallo case has inspired several new rounds of high-level snarling, following the recent distribution of an investigative report that was in preparation in Congress for several years but never officially released.

Charging a whitewash and incompetence in the government's failed scientific misconduct proceedings against the renowned Robert C. Gallo, of the National Cancer Institute, the report is circulating *samizdat* style, like forbidden literature under the Soviet regime—but with a modern-day advantage: It's on the Internet.

Underlying the case is the long-running dispute over Gallo's role in the identification of the AIDS virus and subsequent conflicts with the Pasteur Institute over patent rights for the HIV blood test. Without equivocation, the French say they were robbed, and that's the basic conclusion of the report, produced by staffers of Rep. John Dingell (D-Michigan) before the November deluge. The report also says the leadership of the scientific community defaulted on its responsibility to protect the public and the integrity of science.

In 1992, the Office of Research Integrity returned findings of scientific misconduct against Gallo, but dropped them a year later rather than contest Gallo's planned appeal. He's free and clear in a legal sense, but the misconduct allegations continue to dog him, with the report by the Dingell staff obviously scraping sensitive wounds, despite—or maybe because of—the ambiguous circumstances of its publication.

The cover page of the full report, which contains 267 pages, bears the words: "Staff Report of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Energy and Commerce, United States House of Representatives." By the normal procedures of Congressional publication, however, it is not a Congressional report, since publication was not approved by the Committee under which it was produced.

Nonetheless, there it is, densely packed with data and citations concerning the early days of AIDS research. The report is mainly the work of Suzanne Hadley, an experimental psychologist who initially investigated the charges against Gallo when she worked for what was then called the Office of Scientific Integrity. Following a run-in with the then-newly arrived NIH Director Bernadine Healy, who disapproved of OSI's operating methods, Hadley continued on the case on detail from NIH to Dingell's Subcommittee.

Joining in the cacophony over the report is Healy, who declared Gallo innocent of scientific misconduct in 1992. Healy, back at the Cleveland Clinic after a failed run for the Republican Senatorial nomination in Ohio, attributes the report to the "deluded notions" and "bloated staff" of Dingell. The volatile Healy had numerous clashes with both when she was NIH Director.

In a letter in the January 19 *Chicago Tribune*, Healy described the report as Dingell's "final spasm" before the November elections ended his chairmanship of a subcommit-

tee hot on the trail of scientific misconduct.

But Dingell claims no responsibility for the report. Told that Healy's successor at NIH, Harold Varmus, had seen the report and was not happy about it, Dingell wrote to Varmus on February 3 that "We cannot vouch for the authenticity or accuracy of the papers provided to you"—a dubious assertion, given that the papers were written by longtime members of Dingell's staff and were on the brink of publication when the Republicans won the House. "Drafts and relevant files on this inquiry," Dingell stated in his letter to Varmus, "were turned over to the incoming majority as a pending and uncompleted matter."

The Dingell ex-staff report on the Gallo case, in full length and in "executive summary," is accessible on the World Wide Web at: <http://nyx10.cs.du.edu:8001/~wstewart/>

Ordering information for paper editions, reported to be in preparation, will be provided when available.

It is doubtful that this soothed Varmus, whose appearance in an executive summary of the report is under a heading titled "The Contemporary Coverup," subtitled "The Varmus Era: Will NIH/HHS Face the Facts?" The summary notes that, at Varmus's suggestion, the French have been given a bigger cut of the royalties for the HIV blood test, but otherwise, it expresses disappointment in Varmus.

Varmus did not join Healy's "save Bob [Gallo]" campaign, the summary concedes, but it goes on: "At the same time, as a Nobel laureate who aroused Dr. Gallo's ire, when he (Varmus) headed a commission that changed the name of the AIDS virus to 'HIV,' over Dr. Gallo's strenuous objections, Dr. Varmus had first-hand experience with the manner in which pride and zealotry about one's scientific theories can distort scientific truth and mislead much of the scientific community.

"In short," the summary continues, "there was reason to believe Dr. Varmus might be able and willing to deal forthrightly with the implications of the compelling, recently revealed body of evidence. Dr. Varmus did not fulfill these expectations," the summary states. (Oddly, the section about Varmus in the summary has no counterpart in the full report. That's due to no more than an oversight, according to the ex-Subcommittee staffers who produced the report.)

In distancing himself from the report, why did Congressman Dingell write to NIH Director Varmus? The question leads to two other characters in the misconduct controversy, Walter Stewart and Ned Feder. Members of the NIH Bethesda staff, the two were long ago yanked off their self-initiated fulltime pursuit of scientific miscreants and assigned to routine administrative duties. But, on their own time, they insist, they carry on with studies of misconduct.

In conjunction with their interest in such matters, they
(Continued on Page 6)

Research Gains Some, Loses a Little in New Budget

The budget that the President sent to Congress on February 6 reflects a tender regard for science and technology. In these hard times, that means they didn't lose too much ground and in some cases even gained a bit.

In discussing the spending plans at the annual ritual of budget-day briefings, the message from the Administration's research chiefs was that science did reasonably well in difficult circumstances. The proper yardstick for evaluating the budget is "compared to what?" in the words of John Gibbons, the President's Science and Technology Advisor.

Nonetheless, even as the numbers aficionados pored over the budget tables, everyone realized that Clinton's spending preferences matter little with Capitol Hill in the hands of a new majority sworn to deep spending cuts. Last week's budget is for the fiscal year that begins next October 1, and no one can confidently say what the final numbers will be by then. Congressional dismemberment has already begun on the Defense Department's Technology Reinvestment Project, which was to spend \$450 million this year, and even more next year, on so-called dual-use research.

In the Clinton plan, total federal R&D for the fiscal year beginning October 1 would remain about the same as this year's figure, which is nearly \$73 billion. Factor in inflation, and that works out to a loss of a couple of billion or so.

Basic research, according to the Clinton figures, would rise by 3.5 percent, to a total of \$14.4 billion, which translates into a standstill. The Administration's tables list a 7 percent increase for academic research. But according to an analysis

by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the White House left out an institute in counting up this year's budget at the National Institutes of Health, and the academic increase is really closer to 1 percent.

NIH and the National Science Foundation are budgeted for increases of about 3.7 percent. NASA's budget drops by nearly 1 percent. Agricultural research, long the poor relation of Clinton budget planners, goes down by 3.6 percent.

The big winner, as usual, is the Commerce Department, homebase of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, budgeted for a 9.3 percent increase to finance the fast-growing Advanced Technology Program and other designs for stimulating industrial innovation.

In the usual batch of budget comments from political quarters, support for basic research was perhaps the only common note. Chairman Robert Walker of the House Science Committee said that he and the President "appear to agree on the importance of items like basic research and the space station. I regret, however," Walker added, "the strong emphasis he places in applied science subsidies."

Walker's predecessor in the chairmanship, Rep. George Brown, sounded a gloomy note. Stating that the outlook "for science and technology programs remains grim," Brown expressed fear of what's to come when Congress works over the budget. And he chastised the Administration, saying that it "continues to allow short-term political objectives to override critical investments in science and technology that promise long-term payoffs for the nation."

Gallo Report (Continued from Page 5)

sent a copy of the report to Varmus on January 23, describing it in a cover letter as "a draft report on an investigation of the Gallo case by the staff of a subcommittee headed by Congressman Dingell." In the letter, they said the "draft report raises serious questions about possible misconduct in a particular case and about the proper conduct of science generally." They concluded by asking Varmus to bring the report "to the attention of the appropriate authorities." Stewart and Feder also wrote to Kenneth Ryan, Chairman of the HHS Commission on the Integrity of Research, urging him to initiate an inquiry.

SGR hears that Varmus, not pleased with the report, sought advice from Harriet S. Rabb, General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services, who also gets knocked in the report. Rabb took up the matter with Dingell's staff chief, Alan J. Roth, who from way back doubted the political value of Dingell's clashes with the scientific establishment. The cautious solution was Dingell's letter to Varmus, not wholly repudiating the report—which, after all, was produced under Dingell's chairmanship—but casting doubt on its status as an official Congressional product.

Via the Internet, and in paper copies circulated by a persistent critic of Gallo and declining scientific mores, Serge Lang, Professor of Mathematics at Yale University, the

report is getting around. Lang got a strong, supportive response from one senior scientist at NIH, William A. Hagins, a biophysicist in the Laboratory of Chemical Physics, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases.

Hagins, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, said in that letter that Varmus should issue an apology to the Pasteur Institute "on behalf of present and past officials who engineered this appalling coverup, and on behalf of the scientific staff of NIH." Hagins added that royalties paid to Gallo and colleagues should be retrieved and sent to Pasteur, along with other acts of penance.

"I realize," Hagins wrote to Lang, "that Dr. Varmus would likely be fired in short order if he attempted to do any of this, but nothing would do more to create an issue that scientists, especially intramural NIH scientists, could speak out about than that! For him it would be a wonderful opportunity to become known as the first NIH Director who actually stood for something besides the efficient absorption of federal funds." With his letter, Hagins enclosed a check to Lang "to help with your distribution costs for all of those reports."

Hagins told SGR that he has also written to Varmus—but so far, no reply. Gallo, he said, responded on February 9 "with an abusive phone call."

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, part of the Library of Congress, no charge:

The National Institutes of Health: An Overview (95-96 SPR; 6 pp.), a concise review of the organization and agonies of NIH, including declining success rates in the grants derby and complaints about neglect of clinical research. The report, by Pamela W. Smith, indicates that, contrary to the impression broadcast by biomedical boosters, the NIH budget didn't fare too badly over the past decade. "Even when inflation is taken into the account," it states, "the NIH budget grew by 42.2 percent in the period FY 1984-FY 1994." The pains, it says, arise from a slowdown in recent years that has kept NIH purchasing power essentially level or a bit worse.

Military Space Programs: Issues for the 104th Congress (95-95 SPR; 6 pp.), a glimpse at one of the most elusive and least-examined mega-programs in federal high-tech—the Pentagon's space enterprise, estimated at \$13.5 billion a year, about \$1 billion below NASA's level of expenditure. The report notes, however, that "DOD space spending is extremely difficult to track because space is not a line item in the DOD budget. Rather, the Office of the Secretary of Defense reviews the DOD budget and determines which programs are 'space' and which are not and generates a total dollar amount for funding for space activities." The Pentagon's current space activities are predominantly in earth observation, communications, navigation, and weather. But the report says that the Defense Department is also interested in anti-satellite weapons and space-based weapons for missile defense. Marcia Smith wrote the report.

An Overview of NASA (95-101 SPR; 6 pp.), observes that though NASA has been cutting program costs in response to a stagnant budget, "many people feel that fundamentally NASA simply is funding too many expensive programs." The report, by Stephen J. Garber and David Radzanowski, adds, "With a flat budget that is losing pace with inflation, policymakers may be forced to make hard choices about program priorities at NASA in the coming years. Many observers question whether NASA can continue to fund, on schedule, several large programs such as the Space Station, the Space Shuttle, and the growing Mission to Planet Earth without sacrificing other projects."

Wind Tunnels: Proposal for a New National Wind Tunnel Complex (95-103 SPR; 37 pp.), says that with an average age of 40 years, wind tunnel facilities in the US are so inadequate that American aircraft manufacturers conduct 25 percent of their testing in the same European tunnels used by their leading competitor, Airbus Industries. In addition to difficulties of scheduling and costs, the report states, the use of foreign facilities raises concerns about security, since "it is often difficult to ascertain where the test data does go when being transferred from the recording instruments in the tunnel to nearby computers for storage ... A company tests in a foreign tunnel under the assumption that by the time they

leave, the test results will be largely known to their competitors." The last Congress voted \$400 million for FY '95 for NASA to get started on a wind-tunnel complex estimated to cost \$2.55 billion—but with a proviso that the White House seek another \$400 million in FY '96. No such item was included in the new Clinton budget, but the Administration says it wants to stretch out the decision time about the first \$400 million until September 1997.

Order these reports through a House or Senate member. Senate switchboard, 202/224-3121; House, 202/225-3121. Cite the Congressional Research Service as the source, with report title and number.

Footing the Bill for Superfund Cleanups: Who Pays and How? (176 pp.; cloth, \$32.95; paper, \$12.95; plus \$3 for shipping), from the Brookings Institution and Resources for the Future, prepared in anticipation of Congressional reworking of the 1980 Superfund legislation. Despite the rancor over costs, the authors state, Superfund expenditures are a small part of national environmental spending—\$4 billion out of \$135 billion in 1992. They also observe that "although seemingly everyone has a complaint about the program, the provisions that some would like to see relaxed are the same that others believe need to be strengthened, and vice versa." The difference between the lowest-cost proposal for Superfund taxes and liability and the present plan is stated to be less than 4 percent. The authors are Katherine N. Probst and Paul R. Portney, Resources for the Future; Don Fullerton, Professor of Economics, University of Texas at Austin, and Robert E. Litan, formerly with Brookings, now with the US Department of Justice Antitrust Division.

Order from: Brookings Books, the Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20036-2188; tel. 1/800-275-1447; in the Washington, DC, area, 202/797-6258; fax 202/797-6004.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$455.00 ☐
two years, \$780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface
mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:
Defense Research and Development: Mandated Reports on Noncompetitive Awards to Colleges and Universities (GAO/NSIAD-95-72; 40 pp.), gives names and dollar amounts for the hundreds of academic institutions, including a handful in foreign countries, that shared the \$1.4 billion in contracts and \$769 million in grants awarded by the Pentagon in fiscal 1993 for research and development. Noncompetitive awards—derided as “earmarks” or “pork” by the science establishment and its Congressional friends—accounted for about \$1 billion of the contracts and \$75 million of the grants. A reporting requirement on academic awards was imposed on the Defense Department in 1988 in what appeared to be a victory for the Congressional anti-pork contingent, which contends that earmarking subordinates scientific judgment to political influence.

The GAO notes however, that the law is riddled with loopholes, and that after complying from 1989-91, the Pentagon did not file reports for 1992 or 1993. Little wonder. Often in cozy collusion with Congressional supporters, Defense likes to put its money where it pleases, without the nuisance of competition. The GAO report was requested by the leading opponent of non-competitive research awards, Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), when he chaired what is now called the House Science Committee. His successor in the chair, Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pa.), was allied with Brown in that cause, and says he will carry on the fight.

Information Superhighway: An Overview of Technology Challenges (GAO/AIMD-95-23; 84 pp.), covering well-plowed territory, this one says the federal government possesses the technical expertise and experience to assure privacy and security on the information highway, but says the public fears a federal Big Brother and wants to work out its own security arrangements. The report also says the systems should be easy to use and reliable, observing that recent failures on networks justify concerns about reliability. References are included to a dozen earlier GAO reports on information technologies.

Wildlife Protection: Fish and Wildlife Service's Inspection Program Needs Strengthening (GAO/RCED-95-8; 80 pp.), reports that the Fish and Wildlife Service, part of the Interior Department, is overwhelmed in its responsibility to monitor imports and exports of wildlife and wildlife parts. With an annual budget of about \$5 million in federal appropriations and user fees, 74 wildlife inspectors are assigned to cover 11 ports of entry and other locations for wildlife shipments.

Though they get some help from the US Customs Service, the GAO concludes that “most wildlife shipments are not

physically inspected, and it is likely that many illegal shipments are evading detection.” Recommendations to the Secretary of Interior include development of “outcome-oriented, performance goals” for the inspection service and closer matching of resources and problem areas. Regarding suggestions for transferring wildlife inspection to the Customs Service, the GAO concludes that though it's bigger, it might not put sufficient zest into the task. The report was requested during the last Congress by Rep. Gerry E. Studds (D-Mass.), Chairman of the since-abolished Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Nuclear Nonproliferation: US International Nuclear Materials Tracking Capabilities Are Limited (GAO/RCED/AIMD-95-5; 27 pp.), questions the reliance of US nonproliferation policy on the Department of Energy's Nuclear Materials Management and Safeguards System, which the GAO terms inadequate for the task. Among several major failings, the GAO says, “the system does not track exported US nuclear materials that are moved from facility to facility within countries, nor does it show the current status of the nuclear materials (e.g., irradiated, unirradiated, fabricated, burned up, or reprocessed).”

The report says that DOE has upgraded its computer systems for the safeguards program, but the type of data collected remains unchanged. This report also dates back to the last Congress, where it was requested by Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio), then Chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, and Rep. Charles E. Schumer (D-NY).

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the National Academy of Sciences (NAS):

Evolving the High Performance Computing and Communications Initiative (HPCCI) to Support the Nation's Information Infrastructure (available in March), a study requested by the last Congress, says “our lead is fragile” in computer technology and information systems, and urges the continuation of strong federal support for research and development on the HPCCI—which is what the new Clinton budget calls for, too. The Academy report, however, urges a broadened base of financial support, warning that “reduced funding for the HPCCI could cripple all of computing research. The ‘war on cancer,’ it points out, “did not support all of biomedical research, and neither should the HPCCI or any future initiative on national infrastructure subsume all of computing research.”

The report was produced by the Academy's Committee on High Performance Computing and Communications: Status of a Major Initiative, co-chaired by Frederick P. Brooks Jr., Professor of Computer Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and Ivan E. Sutherland, Vice President, Sun Microsystems Laboratories, Mountain View, California.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242; in the Washington, DC, area: 202/334-3313.

(Continued on Page 7)

